

10/555,728
January 6, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 20, 38, 41, 46, and 48 have been amended. Applicant has canceled Claims 36, 42-45, 47, and 49-50. Applicant has added new Claims 35-50. No new matter is added by the amendments as discussed below. Applicant respectfully requests the entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objection

Claim 41 was objected to because it recited "a transmission system" instead of "the transmission system." In response, Applicant has amended Claim 41 to properly recite "the transmission system." Applicant thus submits that the claim objection has been overcome.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 42-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the November 16, 2009 Office Action suggests that the specification "fails to disclose how Applicant 'briefly [interrupts the] torque to the transmission system' as stated in Claim 42, line 22" (Office Action, page 3).

While Applicant disagrees with the rejection, in order to expedite prosecution Applicant has canceled Claims 42-45, 47, and 49-50, and has amended Claims 46 and 48 to depend from Claim 38. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that the rejection of Claims 42-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is now moot. Applicant reserves the right to further prosecute the previous versions of Claims 42-50 through continuation practice.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the November 16, 2009 Office Action suggests that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the disc spring" in line 2.

In response, Applicant has amended Claim 20 to recite "wherein the spring comprises a disc spring having a plurality of arms." Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim 38 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the November 16, 2009 Office Action suggests that there

10/555,728
January 6, 2006

is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the second gear wheel" in Claim 38, and that Claim 38 appears to be missing details between lines 6 and 7.

In response, Applicant has amended Claim 38 to recite, in part, "providing first and second gear trains for transferring drive from one of the shafts to the other shaft, the first gear train including a first gear wheel rotatably mounted on the first shaft and the second gear train includes a second gear wheel rotatably mounted on the first shaft, said first and second gear wheels having drive formation formed thereon, and said second gear wheel being part of a higher gear than the first gear wheel." Applicant submits that this amendment overcomes the rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

For at least the reasons described above, Applicant submits that Claims 20, 38-41, 46, and 48 satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Amended Claims 1 and 38 Are In Condition For Allowance

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indicated that Claim 36 would be allowable if amended into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. While Applicant disagrees with the outstanding rejections, as specifically noted below, Applicant has canceled Claim 36 and incorporated the subject matter thereof into Claim 1. Applicant has also incorporated the subject matter of Claim 36 into Claim 38, and submits that for at least the same reasons that the subject matter of Claim 36 makes Claim 1 allowable, the subject matter of Claim 36 also makes Claim 38 allowable. For example, none of the cited references discloses or suggests, alone or in combination, "wherein each engagement member includes a body that is substantially rigid such that the first and second engagement faces are arranged in a fixed relationship to one another" as recited by Claim 36. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 38 are in condition of allowance. Additionally, Applicant submits that Claims 2-5, 7-20, 22-25, 35, 37, 39-41, 46, and 48 are also in condition for allowance, not only because they depend from one of Claims 1 and 38, but also on their own merit.

Rejection of Claims 42, 43, and 45-49 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 42, 43, and 45-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by US 3,872,737 to Thomas (Thomas '737). Applicant disagrees with the rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has canceled Claims 42, 43, 45, 47, and 49, and has amended Claims 38, 46, and 48 as described above. For at least the reasons described above, Applicant submits that Claims 46 and 48 are in condition for allowance, not only because they

10/555,728
January 6, 2006

depend from Claim 38, but also on their own merit. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the original versions of Claims 46 and 48 through continuation practice.

Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-19, 22-24, 35, 37-41, and 44 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-19, 22-24, 35, 37-41, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas '737. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has canceled Claim 44, and has amended Claims 1, 7, and 38 as described above. For at least the reasons described above, Applicant submits that Claims 1-5, 7-19, 22-24, 35, and 37-41 are in condition for allowance, not only because they depend from one of Claims 1 and 38, but also on their own merit. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the original versions of Claims 1-5, 7-19, 22-24, 35, 37-41, and 44 through continuation practice.

Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas '737 in view of US 4,098,380 to Thomas (Thomas '380). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended Claim 1 as described above. For at least the reasons described above, Applicant submits that Claim 25 is in condition for allowance, not only because it depends from Claim 1, but also on its own merit. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the original versions of Claim 25 through continuation practice.

Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomas '737 in view of Thomas '380, and further in view of US 4,241,818 to Miller (Miller). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 20 as described above. For at least the reasons described above, Applicant submits that Claim 20 is in condition for allowance, not only because it depends from Claim 1, but also on its own merit. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the original versions of Claim 20 through continuation practice.

No Disclaimers or Disavowals

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, Applicant is not conceding in this

10/555,728
January 6, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 16 2010

application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Accordingly, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is most earnestly solicited.

The undersigned has made a good faith effort to respond to all of the rejections in the case and to place the claims in condition for immediate allowance. Nevertheless, if any undeveloped issues remain or if any issues require clarification, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicant's attorney in order to resolve such issue promptly.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: February 16, 2010

By: 

Daniel E. Altman
Registration No. 34,115
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

8551910
021210